



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bryce well says, the task was made easy because there has always been a dearth of brains in the Tory party. If Disraeli had been a Whig, he would have found many rivals, but as a Tory he had a free field.

It has often been said that Disraeli was inconsistent. But what English statesman of his day was not? On that score he will certainly compare favorably with Gladstone or with the Sage of Birmingham. Even in the O'Connell case, although we must admit that he was ungrateful, we can hardly accuse him of inconsistency. The fight for Catholic emancipation and for parliamentary reform almost completely destroyed the old party lines. Disraeli in 1832 was neither a Whig nor a Tory; he was simply a Radical. As such he sought and secured the assistance of O'Connell, who was himself estranged from the Whigs at that time. When the parties began to settle again along their old lines, O'Connell saw fit to rejoin the Whigs, whereas Disraeli became a Tory. He was, though, as Meynell says, always a Radical Tory. Like the Pitts, he hated the aristocracy which had controlled the Whig party throughout its career, and which in his own day was securing too great influence among the Tories. He democratized the Tory party, prevented it from deserting entirely the principles of protection, and started it on its career of imperialism. When he made his sarcastic comment on Joseph Chamberlain's first speech, that "he wore his eye-glass like a gentleman", he would have been greatly surprised to know that within a quarter of a century Chamberlain would be following in his footsteps and fighting the battle for the preservation of the British Empire.

W. ROY SMITH.

Autobiography of Seventy Years. By GEORGE F. HOAR. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Two vols., pp. ix, 434; viii, 493.)

THE autobiography of Senator Hoar is a delightful book to read, filled with anecdote and humor, permeated with cheerfulness and optimism, honest, direct, and enthusiastic — in short, exactly what one would expect from its honored author. In scope the work is rather narrower than many of the other important autobiographical writings of the past few years, such as Blaine's *Twenty Years of Congress*, Sherman's *Recollections*, and the books of McCulloch and Boutwell in the same field; for it does not deal with the history of the United States in any sense, but simply with the career of George F. Hoar. Since this was almost wholly legislative, events of a military or administrative character are ignored, and the resulting limitation of subject adds greatly to the unity of interest of the work. The first chapters deal with the author's ancestry, boyhood, and school-days — in many respects they are the most graphic and entertaining in the two volumes — and are followed by a narrative of Mr. Hoar's career in the stormy state politics of Massachusetts during the Free-soil movement. Then comes the history of Mr. Hoar's legislative services, first in the House of Representatives and later in the Senate, to

which are added occasional parenthetical chapters dealing with the Republican national conventions attended by Mr. Hoar, his European journeys, and his reminiscences of lawyers, orators, and other distinguished men. Merely to enumerate the important events in which Mr. Hoar took part during this long career would be impossible in a review of moderate dimensions; suffice it to say that from the time he entered the House, in 1869, to the present day there has scarcely been any significant political episode in Congress in which he did not play an actual part, modestly and most entertainingly described in these two volumes.

But perhaps the strongest impression derived from the nine hundred pages is the revelation of character they contain, and this in spite of the fact that the author's private life is passed over for the most part in silence or with a few references of perfect modesty and dignity. Yet since it is not the province of the REVIEW to study the man himself, but rather the historical significance of the work, one must pass by the tempting opportunity and touch upon those traits only that affect the accuracy and historical value of the descriptions of men and events. Such is the honesty, frankness, and transparency of the writer that this is not a difficult task.

The most striking feature of the autobiography from a historical point of view is the prominence of the author's political preferences. Senator Hoar is a consistent individualistic liberal of the old school, a firm believer in the dignity of human nature and the rights of man. Standing squarely on the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, he maintains the justice and essential wisdom of the Reconstruction measures with the same earnestness as that shown in his opposition to the forcible annexation of the Philippines. By these principles he judges men, measures, and parties, and only through their application does he expect to see present difficulties solved. He says:

We should have had little difficulty in dealing with the Negro or the Indian, or the Oriental, if the American people had applied to them, as the Golden Rule requires, the principles they expect to apply and to have applied to themselves. We have never understood that in some essential matters human nature is the same in men of all colors and races. Our Fathers of the time of the Revolution understood this matter better than we do (I. 259).

Holding to this view, it is impossible that Senator Hoar should sympathize with or even comprehend a Southern man or an imperialist. Practical difficulties he admits; he is willing to concede that "a large number of the men who got political office in the South, when . . . the Republicans were still in power, were of a character that would not have been tolerated in public office in the North" (II. 161), and that the Filipinos are "just coming out of barbarism", but these in his mind count as nothing before the demands of human equality and human rights.

Senator Hoar has in addition to these principles an almost religious belief in the past and present merits of the Republican party, and repeatedly takes occasion to define his position. He is not a partizan

from prejudice, he says, but as the result of "as cool, calculating, sober and deliberate reflection as I am able to give to any question of conduct or duty". Accordingly he "believes with all his heart and soul in the principles of the Republican party", and such being the case, nothing will induce him to leave it. It is true, he admits, that there was great corruption under Grant, but adds :

It never occurred to me that these abuses furnished any reason for placing the powers of the Government in the hands of the Southern Democracy, or their ally, Tammany Hall. If the men who saved the Union were not to be trusted to keep it pure ; if the men who abolished slavery could not carry on a Government in freedom and in honor, certainly it was not likely that the men of Tammany Hall, or the men who had so lately attempted to overthrow the Government, would do it any better (I. 309).

An additional reason in his opinion for adhering to the Republican party is that it contains most of the good men of the country, while the Democratic party contains most of the others. Nothing could be more explicit than this :

The Republican Party, whatever its faults, since it came into power in 1860 has been composed in general of what is best in our national life. . . . On the other hand their antagonist has been, is, and for an indefinite time to come will be, controlled by the foreign population and the criminal classes of our great cities, by Tammany Hall, and by the leaders of the solid South (I. 200).

Writing, then, as an honest partizan, frankly biased on events not within the limits of the Republican party, Mr. Hoar contributes a mass of anecdote, political and personal. In the Reconstruction period and more recently he frankly admits the party's defects and mistakes, but he describes nothing novel beyond some personal incidents. Evidently Senator Hoar's own philosophy of history is Carlylesque. He is especially fond of showing the dependence of a chain of important events upon the error of some one man or the choice of some small group. Since history appears so largely an affair of persons in Senator Hoar's eyes, his attitude toward persons becomes of importance ; and here we find him a man of great kindliness, optimism, and generosity — toward Republicans. He endeavors to see the good side of people, to give men their due, and when he feels himself biased in any one's disfavor, he usually makes a frank admission of the fact. For the men he wholly likes he cherishes an unstinted admiration and upon them he pours out superlative eulogy. Yet Mr. Hoar's judgments, while highly optimistic, are by no means wholly indiscriminating ; his heroes are not all perfect, and in his descriptions of their weak points he often shows a pen keen as well as humorous. What wins him is evidently personal warmth and kindliness. Even Democrats, Southern fire-eaters, whose principles were utterly abhorrent, receive kindly notice from this reason in several cases.

On the other hand, the man of bitter tongue, brusqueness, or intolerance is either ignored or treated with scant patience. Over President Harrison's lack of urbanity the author laments with constantly recurring

regret that so worthy a man — and a Republican at that — should be so lacking in tact. The few men whom Senator Hoar clearly dislikes are almost all men of sharp speech, such as Conkling, Ingalls, Butler, Wendell Phillips, and Tillman. Democrats in general Mr. Hoar passes over with slight mention, if we except the few Southerners he found attractive. To one group of men, however, the author never fails to refer with contempt and asperity — the independents. “It is said that no man is a hero to his valet”, he remarks (I. 313). “The reason is . . . that the valet cannot see anything that is great and noble, but only what is mean and base. The history of no people is heroic to its Mugwumps.” Elsewhere he says: “They have commonly discussed the profoundest and subtlest questions with an angry and bitter personality which finds its parallel only in the theological treatises of the dark ages. It is lucky for some of us that they have not had the fires of Smithfield or of the Inquisition at their command.” Still again he speaks of the independent newspapers, who “welcomed any opportunity to support their theory that American public life was rotten and corrupt”. One cannot help feeling that since the principles of most of the mugwumps are identical with those of Mr. Hoar, the antagonism felt between them reduces itself largely to a question of manners.

A few statements of fact deserve discussion. The assertion (I. 145) that “the Free Soil Party derived its chief strength . . . of numbers . . . from the Whigs” seems questionable when the votes are studied. Unless we are to suppose a great migration of Democrats to the Whig ticket in 1848, at least two-thirds of the new party must have been drawn from the Liberty and Democratic ranks. Again, in saying that “the Liberty Party . . . was willing to support the candidates of other parties who were personally unobjectionable”, whereas “the Free Soil Party . . . determined that no person should receive its support for any national office who himself continued his association with either of the old political organizations”, an entirely false impression is created. In fact, the Liberty party adhered rigidly to its own candidates, while the Free-soil party made more coalitions than any other third party before the days of the Populists. In the same volume, page 285, Chase is represented as being mainly responsible for the issue of legal tenders in 1862, and as their original advocate; but Chase’s latest biographer makes it clear that he took the step with great reluctance and only in response to Congressional pressure. In the second volume, in discussing the Reconstruction period, Mr. Hoar says, page 162, “Suffrage was conferred upon the negro by the Southern States themselves”; but while this is technically true, the method of its conferring under the terms of the Reconstruction acts scarcely left it a voluntary process. It is in such statements as this that Mr. Hoar’s unconscious partizanship becomes evident, but its most surprising result is seen in the twice repeated assertion that in “the first sixteen years of the Government, which included the Administrations of Washington and John Adams and the first term of Jefferson . . . there was not only more corruption in proportion than there had

been under Grant, but there had been more in amount, notwithstanding the difference in population" (I. 309). That the handful of office-holders, transacting the modest finances of a small nation under such men as Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, should have been thought capable of exceeding in amount the corruption of the Reconstruction administrations in a time of general inflation, indebtedness, and speculation is almost unthinkable, and cannot be taken seriously. The context shows that Mr. Hoar's opinion was formed as the result of some study undertaken during the Belknap episode in Grant's second term for the purpose of defending the administration. What was then said as a plea in mitigation for the Republican party is now repeated as though it were ascertained history.

Perhaps the kernel of the work lies in the author's summary of his own contribution to recent history, in places where he claims to have exercised decisive influence. Among such are his suggestion of several appointments to Presidents Hayes, Harrison, and McKinley, his membership of the Electoral Commission of 1877, his share in the nomination of Garfield in 1880, and the authorship of some important bills. He maintains that whenever he has differed from his party in any policy, he has been justified by the event. "In every single instance unless the question of the Philippine Islands shall prove an exception . . . the party has come round, in the end, to my way of thinking."

But the permanent value of the volumes, apart from their wealth of anecdotal and personal material, will be in the picture of the career of a conscientious public servant, who could truly say that his life was spent in unselfish legislative duties, which brought neither riches nor inordinate power. "I think I may fairly claim", he modestly says, "that I have done my share of the work of the Senate and of the House to the best of my ability. Senator Edmunds when he left the Senate was kind enough to compliment me by saying that the whole work of the Senate was done by six men, of whom I was one." That this opinion is no great exaggeration appears when one studies the chapter where Mr. Hoar's lifelong committee service is described. He is a true type of the older statesman, the liberal Puritan, if the term be not a solecism, of the early nineteenth century, a type now fast disappearing. How many of our leading senators could say as does Senator Hoar, "I have never lifted my finger or spoken a word to any man to secure or to promote my own election to any office"?

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

Dochet (St. Croix) Island : a Monograph. By W. F. GANONG, M.A., Ph.D. (Ottawa : J. Hope and Sons ; Toronto : The Copp-Clark Company ; London : Bernard Quaritch. 1902. Pp. 127-231.)

THIS is the separate issue which really appeared in the summer of 1903, and is to form a part of the *Transactions of the Royal Society of*